IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Latrell Gillett, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

No.: 20 Civ. 3734 (KPF)

-against-

ZARA USA, INC., and INDITEX USA LLC,

Defendants.

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY IN FURTHER OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS PUTSUANT TO RULE 12(b)(6)

Plaintiff, by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby submits this Notice of Supplemental Authority in further opposition of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6).

In Caul v. Petco Animal Supplies, Inc., Judge Kovner addressed a request to certify a previous order denying the defendants' motion to dismiss claims under NYLL § 191(1)(a) for interlocutory appeal. See No. 20 Civ. 3534 (RPK) (SJB), Minute Entry Dated Dec. 22, 2021 (E.D.N.Y.). Defendants argued that there was ground for a substantial difference of option on whether NYLL § 191 afforded a private right of action to the plaintiff, and whether temporary deprivation of money consisted sufficient injury to establish standing. See id. Judge Kovner denied the request, finding that there was no basis "[t]here is not substantial ground for a difference of opinion as to the availability of a private right of action for delayed waged payments under the NYLL." See id. (citing Vega v. CM & Assoc. Const. Mngmt., LLC, 175 A.D. 3d 1144, 1145-46 (N.Y. App. Div. 2019). Judge Kovner further found that "there is not ground for substantial

difference of opinion about whether the temporary deprivation of money to which a plaintiff has a right is a sufficient injury to establish standing." *See id.* (citing *SPA Claims 1, LLC v. Tenet Florida,* 918 F.3d 1312, 318 (11th Cir. 2019); *Van v. LLR, Inc.*, 962 F.3d 1160, 1161, 1162-63 (9th Cir. 2020) (per curiam); *Habitat Educ. Center v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 607 F.3d 453, 457 (7th Cir. 2010)

Here, Defendants' arguments are substantially similar to the defendants in Caul. For example, Defendants make the same argument that "there is conflicting caselaw with respect to the question of whether a private right of action exists [under NYLL § 191]. See ECF No. 59, pg. 12. However, similar to *Caul*, Defendants have not supplied "any relevant or persuasive conflicting opinions that raise genuine doubt as to the Court's obligation to follow Vega." See id. Moreover, the Caul defendants citied the same exact cases Defendants have here to argue that Plaintiff had not established standing. Compare ECF No. 59, pg. 6; with No. 20 Civ. 3534 (RPK) (SJB), ECF No. 22-1, pg. 10. Judger Kovner did not credit these cases, finding them to be "overshadowed by better reasoned and more recent cases." See id. (citing Van, 962 F.3d at 1161-1163; Habitat Educ. Center, 607 F. 3d at 457). Moreover, Judger Kovner noted that reliance on Kawa Orthodontics, LLP v. Secretary, U.S. Dept of the Treasury was misplaced, because "defendants fail to note that the Eleventh Circuit subsequently recognized that the lost use of money can in fact support standing." See id. (citing MSPA Claims 1, LLC, 918 F. 3d at 1318). Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court consider the Caul decision in rendering its decision on Defendants' motion.

¹ The similarities in Defendants' arguments and the *Caul* defendants' arguments are further evidenced because Defendants here are represented by the same firm and counsel that the *Caul* defendants are. Moreover, while Mr. Freedberg has not appeared in the *Caul* matter, he did sign defendants' reply brief. *See* No. 20 Civ. 3534 (RPK) (SJB), ECF No. 27, pg. 9.

Dated: New York, New York December 23, 2021

By: s/Brian S. Schaffer
Brian S. Schaffer

Brian S. Schaffer Hunter G Benharris FITAPELLI & SCHAFFER LLP 28 Liberty Street, 30th Floor New York, NY 10005 Telephone: (212) 300-0375 Facsimile: (212) 481-1333 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the

Putative Class

TO: LITTLER MEDELSON, P.C. Eli Z. Freedberg 900 Third Avenue

New York, New York 10022 Telephone: (212) 583-8600 efreedberg@littler.com